

## REMARKS

The present amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated February 5, 2007, which set a three-month period for response, making this amendment due by May 5, 2007.

Claims 9-15 are pending in this application.

In the Office Action, claim 11 was objected to for an informality. Claims 9 and 11-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,236,714 to Traut and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 4,202,721 to Roberts and U.S. Patent No. 5,725,711 to Taylor. Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Traut, Taylor, and Roberts as applied to claim 9 above and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,094,435 to Scherer. The Applicant's terminal disclaimer filed January 12, 2007 was accepted and recorded.

In the present amendment, claim 11 has been amended to correct the noted typographical error. No further amendments to the claims have been made.

Rather, the Applicant respectfully disagrees that the cited reference combination of the Traut, Roberts, and Taylor patents render obvious the present invention as defined in independent claim 9. The Applicant submits further that the elements required for maintaining prima facie obvious under Section 103 have not been met.

Claim 9 defines an installation for production of plastic laminates including multi-layer laminates with the following elements:

a cold press with a fixed lower plate and an upper mobile plate;

a metal band placed on an upper surface of the lower plate to support and draw inside the press the components of the plastic laminates consisting of bands of pre-preg and strips of copper,;

the metal band is unwound by **electric motor-driven means** from a reel placed at entry to the press and rewound onto a reel placed at an exit from the press;

**a pair of electrodes situated respectively at an entrance to and at the exit from the press;**

**the pair of electrodes are connected to the electric circuit of a generator of electric current of adequate power,**

**the band maintains continuous contact with the pair of electrodes.**

wherein when the components of the plastic laminates have been drawn inside the press, thereby causing closure of both the press and the electric circuit, **a fraction of said metal band between the two electrodes** acts as an electric resistance generating heat required for pressing.

In the listing of elements of claim 9 above, the features that are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references are indicated in italicized boldface.

In the Examiner's analysis of the references and claim 9 on page 3 of the Office Action, no discussion is provided on the above feature. Neither Traut, Taylor nor Roberts provides or suggests specifically the provision of a "***pair of electrodes***", ***one positioned at an exit of the press and one positioned at an entrance to the press***. Traut provides no electrical source, while Roberts specifically discloses voltage sources 64, 65 which clearly are disposed nowhere near the respective entrance or exit of the press (see Fig. 1 and column 4, lines 33-47).

Claim 9 defines further that the pair of electrodes is ***connected to the electric circuit of a generator of electric current of adequate power***; and that ***the band maintains continuous contact with the pair of electrodes***.

Again, in the Office Action, these elements of claim 9 were not addressed; specifically, none of the cited references was put forth as showing these features. The Applicants respectfully submits that none of the cited references shows or suggests a pair of electrodes connect to an electric circuit of a generator AND that the band maintains continuous contact with the pair of electrode.

Each of the cited references, in fact, fails to disclose or suggest these features. Therefore, if the practitioner were to combine the cited references, as proposed, he would not be lead to the present invention, since the combination does not disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 9. It is respectfully submitted that since the prior art does not suggest the desirability of the claimed invention, such art cannot establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness as clearly set forth in MPEP section 2143.01.

The mere fact that the prior art may be modified in the manner suggested by the Examiner does not make the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification. *In re Fritch*, 23 USPQ 2d 1780, 1783-84 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 9-15 define a patentably distinct set of features that is not rendered obvious by the cited reference combination. The Applicant further submits that the present application now stands in condition for allowance. Action to this end is courteously solicited.

Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, the undersigned would very much welcome a telephone call in order to discuss appropriate claim language that will place the application into condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

**/ Michael J. Striker /**

Michael J. Striker  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No.: 27233  
103 East Neck Road  
Huntington, New York 11743  
631-549-4700